

Los Alamos National Laboratory is operated by the University of California for the United States Department of Energy under contract W-7405-ENG-36

TITLE COMPLEX DYNAMICS OF THE INTEGER QUANTUM HALL EFFECT

AUTHOR(S) S. A. Trugman and V. Nikos Nicopoulos

SUBMITTED TO Workshop on Theory of Physical Phenomena at High Magnetic Fields, Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL, May 15-18, 1991

DISCLAIMER

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof.

By acceptance of this article, the publisher recognizes that the U.S. Government retains a nonexclusive, royalty-free license to publish or reproduce the published form of this contribution, or to allow others to do so, for U.S. Government purposes.

The Los Alamos National Laboratory requests that the publisher identify this article as work performed under the auspices of the U.S. Department of Energy.

 **Los Alamos** Los Alamos National Laboratory
Los Alamos, New Mexico 87545

MASTER

Complex Dynamics of the Integer Quantum Hall Effect

S. A. Trugman^a and V. Nikos Nicopoulos^{a,b}

^a *Theoretical Division MS-B262, Los Alamos National Laboratory,*

Los Alamos, NM 87545

^b *Department of Physics, University of Florida,*

Gainesville, FL 32611

We investigate both classical and quantum potential scattering in two dimensions in a magnetic field, with applications to the integer quantum Hall effect. Classical scattering is complex, due in one case to the approach of scattering states to an infinite number of bound states. We show that bound states are generic, and occur for all but extremely smooth scattering potentials ($|\vec{\nabla}V| \rightarrow 0$). Quantum scattering follows the classical behavior rather closely, exhibiting sharp resonances rather than classical bound states. Extended scatterers provide an explanation for the breakdown of the QHE at a comparatively small Hall voltage.

I. INTRODUCTION

The quantum Hall effect has been reviewed by Prange and Girvin.¹ It occurs when electrons are confined to two dimensions and placed in a strong magnetic field. The Hamiltonian is

$$H = \frac{1}{2m} \sum_j (\vec{p}_j - \frac{e\vec{A}_j}{c})^2 + \sum_j V_R(\vec{r}_j) + \sum_{j < k} v_{12}(|\vec{r}_j - \vec{r}_k|) + [-e\vec{E} \cdot \sum_j \vec{r}_j], \quad (1)$$

where the magnetic field $\vec{B} = \vec{\nabla} \times \vec{A} = B\hat{z}$ and $\vec{r}_j = (x, y)$. The first term is the electron kinetic energy in the presence of a magnetic field. The second is a random potential, due perhaps to impurities. The third term is the interaction between electrons. The final term is added to indicate that we seek the linear and nonlinear

response to a Hall electric field \vec{E} .

The fractional quantum Hall effect (FQHE) has plateaus of the Hall conductivity $\sigma_{xy} = (p/q) e^2/h$, where p and q are integers. It is a many-body problem in which the first and third terms in Eq. (1) are most important. The FQHE will not be discussed in this paper.

The integer quantum Hall effect has plateaus of the Hall conductivity at integer multiples of e^2/h . Most of the essential physics of the IQHE is captured by the one-body problem with the v_{12} term omitted. That is the approach taken here. Note that the random potential V_R cannot be omitted, even in the first approximation. Without V_R , the problem is simple to solve exactly, and the plateaus in the Hall conductivity disappear.

For the IQHE, perhaps the most basic question one could ask is: *"How does potential scattering happen in a magnetic field?"* As we discuss below, potential scattering in a magnetic field is quite complicated, and not completely understood. This question is often bypassed in the theory of the IQHE. Laughlin, for example, has given an elegant gauge invariance argument for the quantization of the Hall conductivity.² This argument cannot, however, explain what happens to σ_{xy} or σ_{xx} off of a plateau or at nonzero temperature or frequency. It also cannot explain nonlinear response, including the breakdown of the QHE, or noise or fluctuation effects. To deal with these questions, one must answer the basic question about scattering in a magnetic field. We first consider classical potential scattering in a magnetic field, and then quantum scattering.

II. CLASSICAL POTENTIAL SCATTERING

In zero magnetic field, scattering from a convex object is trivial. Trajectories either collide once with the object, or miss entirely (see Fig. 1).

In a nonzero magnetic field perpendicular to the plane, a Hall electric field must also be present. Otherwise, a particle far from the potential will circle in a closed cyclotron orbit, and never encounter the potential. The Hall electric field is taken to be in the \hat{y} direction in this article

Scattering in a magnetic field appears to divide into two cases, (1) scattering from a smooth, slowly varying potential, and (2) scattering from a more rapidly varying potential. In the first case, scattering is tame. The guiding center of the incident particle's cyclotron orbit nearly follows an equipotential surface. The particle detours around the scatterer, and emerges with almost the same y guiding center coordinate that it entered with (see Fig. 2). The only important effect of the scatterer is that the outgoing particle reaches a given x coordinate at an earlier time than it would have for $V = 0$. This problem has been discussed by several authors.³⁻⁻⁶

Scattering from an abrupt barrier is more complicated. In contrast to scattering from a very smooth potential, the trajectory may encircle the scatterer many times before it escapes. The outgoing y guiding center coordinate can also be quite different from the incoming coordinate (see Fig. 3). As discussed in section III, the scattering dynamics of abrupt potentials are *generic* and apply to potentials with finite gradients as well.

A special case that can be solved completely is scattering from a thin horizontal wall.^{7,8} A portion of a scattering trajectory is shown in Fig. (4). For this case, the y guiding center coordinate is a constant of the motion, so that the most interesting variable is the number of collisions. For a general hard scatterer, one can turn the continuous scattering trajectory into a discrete hamiltonian map, by recording only the points of collision with the scatterer. In general, this is a two-dimensional map, because both the collision point and contact angle are required to calculate the next collision point (and contact angle). For the thin horizontal wall, however, since the

y guiding center coordinate is a constant of the motion, the hamiltonian map is one-dimensional.

The perimeter of the horizontal wall is parameterized by $x \in [0, 1]$. There are two dimensionless parameters, the diameter of the cyclotron orbit α , and the amount by which the orbit translates in one period, which is proportional to the Hall field \vec{E} , equal to 2β . Both α and β are measured in units of the perimeter of the wall. There is also an initial condition, the angle $\theta \in [0, 2\pi)$ at which the particle begins with its guiding center a specified distance from the barrier.

The one-dimensional Hamiltonian map can be used to calculate the number of collisions N , maximized over the initial condition θ , for a given set of parameters. A fairly typical section through parameter space is shown in Fig. (5). For the largest r plotted (largest electric fields), the particle can collide no more than 5 times with the barrier. As the field is reduced, it becomes possible to collide 9 times, then 13. As r is reduced further, N diverges. (All of the spikes in Fig. (5) diverge to infinity, and appear finite only because of fixed numerical resolution.) N comes down, diverges again, and in fact diverges an infinite number of times before reaching an accumulation point at $r = 3.5$. A simple analytic formula describes the location of the divergences. Other sets of divergences are found at still lower r .

As r approaches a typical point of divergence, the particle trajectory approaches a periodic trajectory, such as the one shown in Fig. (6). A scattering state coming from $-\infty$ cannot become caught in a periodic trajectory. It can, however, become caught in a trajectory that is arbitrarily close to a periodic trajectory. In that case, the trajectory corresponds to slightly mistuned parameters, so that the trajectory comes close to the periodic trajectory, but does not quite close.

If one plots the set of points in parameter space at which infinite trajectories exist, Fig. (7) results. The periodic orbits occur on rays coming from the origin. As will

be discussed below, there are also lines of *quasiperiodic* infinite orbits, such as the one extending upward and to the right from $(r, s) = (0.25, 0)$. The lines of periodic orbits are impaled on the lines of quasiperiodic orbits. The length of the periodic line segments is a discontinuous function of the distance along the quasiperiodic line.

One can construct an exact renormalization group (RG) description of the orbits. The RG is implemented by constructing first return maps of ever smaller intervals of the perimeter of the wall. The intervals must be chosen with care so that the map does not become more complicated at each stage. The existence of quasiperiodic infinite orbits is known because one of the fixed points describes quasiperiodic trajectories. Details of the RG are described in Ref. (7).

III. GENERAL POTENTIALS

The thin horizontal wall shows unusual scattering behavior in a magnetic field, including the existence of infinite orbits. It is important to know whether infinite orbits occur for general potentials in a magnetic field, or whether they are specific to the thin horizontal wall. It will be shown that infinite orbits occur in general, for both abrupt and smooth potentials.

The abrupt potential considered in this section is a general simple closed curve Λ , outside of which the potential $V(\vec{r})$ vanishes, and inside of which the potential is infinite (or equivalently, larger than the maximum kinetic energy of the scattering particle). The curve Λ should be differentiable (have a unique tangent vector) almost everywhere. A particle whose trajectory intersects Λ reflects specularly at the boundary, with the angle of incidence equal to the angle of reflection.

Consider an arbitrary initial position and momentum (\vec{r}, \vec{p}) , as shown in Fig. (8). Somewhere along the trajectory, place a short reflecting line segment at an arbitrary angle. The particle collides, and another line segment is placed across a later part

of the trajectory. This process is continued, and in most cases the trajectory will eventually intersect itself. The final line segment is placed through this intersection at an angle so that the angle of incidence equals the angle of reflection. The final line segment is shaded with stripes. The full curve Λ can be any curve that passes through the points at which the collisions occur with a tangent vector parallel to the line segments.

Many potentials that have an infinite periodic trajectory for a given initial position and momentum have thus been constructed. The set of potentials is of co-dimension 2, since what is required is that the one-dimensional manifold Λ intersects a particular point with a particular slope (at the striped line segment). As before, by slightly mistuning the parameters (initial position, momentum, electric field, or magnetic field), a scattering state results that collides with the potential an arbitrarily large number of times before escaping to infinity.

We have also demonstrated a solution to a different problem: given a potential, to find an initial (\vec{r}, \vec{p}) that results in a periodic trajectory. This problem was solved analytically for rectangles.⁹ One can also make the following observation for general abrupt potentials. Assume the magnetic field, the Hall field, and the potential are given. The initial conditions for a trajectory are the initial point along the perimeter, and the initial momentum vector given by $|\vec{p}|$ and θ_p . If the trajectory is to be periodic after one orbit, it must return to the initial point with the correct contact angle. Since energy is conserved, $|\vec{p}|$ will be correct if the contact point is correct. There are 3 initial conditions and two equations to be satisfied. Usually (but not always) there will be a one-dimensional manifold of solutions.

The thin horizontal wall is known to have two classes of infinite trajectories, periodic and quasiperiodic. It is not known whether infinite trajectories that are not periodic exist for general potentials.

We now consider smooth potentials $V(\vec{r})$ that do not have abrupt walls, but rather may have a well-defined finite gradient everywhere. The following discussion does not apply to the special case in which V is infinitely slowly varying ($|\vec{\nabla}V|$ is infinitesimal everywhere), which results in trajectories that follow equipotential lines to arbitrarily good approximation.

Scattering from a smooth potential that has a finite gradient everywhere is compared with scattering from an abrupt potential in Fig. (9). It is clear that there are no important qualitative differences between the two cases. For smooth potentials, the trajectory does not advance as far to the right. Comparable behavior then occurs in a shorter distance. The construction illustrated in Fig. (8) can be repeated with the reflecting line segments replaced by regions where V rises at a finite rate. It is simplest if the striped line segment at the self-intersection remains an abrupt reflecting wall. This wall can, however, be replaced by a region where V rises at a finite rate in the vicinity of the self-intersection. Periodic trajectories thus occur for smooth potentials as well.

IV. QUANTUM POTENTIAL SCATTERING

In the quantum problem, the radius of the cyclotron orbit is quantized. The allowed radii correspond to the Landau levels $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$. An electron has a second quantum number \vec{k} , which (in the Landau gauge) adjusts its y guiding center coordinate. An incident electron wavefunction $|n_1, \vec{k}_1\rangle$ can scatter and emerge in state $|n_2, \vec{k}_2\rangle$. Since energy is conserved in the collision, for each outgoing Landau level index n_2 , only one guiding center momentum k_2 is allowed. For example, suppose the Landau level index is increased by 1 in the collision, increasing the particle's kinetic energy by $\hbar\omega_c$. Then \vec{k} must change by an amount such that the y guiding center coordinate moves downhill in the Hall electric field \vec{E} , lowering the potential energy by exactly

$\hbar\omega_c$.

Quantum scattering is described by a scattering matrix that gives both the amplitude and the phase to scatter into a given Landau level. An incident electron that develops a substantial amplitude to scatter into a higher Landau level, for example as \vec{E} is increased, signals the breakdown of the quantum Hall effect. Because the y guiding center changes, the collision induces a component of the current in the direction of the electric field, or a nonzero σ_{xx} . A conductivity σ_{xx} that increases rapidly with E is an experimental sign of the breakdown of the QHE.¹⁰ To see the relevance of the phase ϕ of the scattering matrix, consider a case where most of the scattering amplitude is diagonal (the Landau level index does not change). The group velocity v_g of a wavepacket is proportional to $\partial\phi/\partial E$, where the energy E is proportional to \vec{k} (and to the y guiding center coordinate). Thus, a rapid change in $\partial\phi/\partial E$ can signal that the wavepacket is getting caught in a resonance, which is the quantum equivalent of a long classical orbit.

The quantum scattering effects of interest cannot be calculated by perturbing in the potential $V(\vec{r})$ or in the Hall field \vec{E} , nor are they given by methods such as the self-consistent Born approximation. We have used two methods for quantum scattering. The first is an exact transfer matrix method applied to a lattice that is finite in the \hat{y} direction and infinite in the \hat{x} direction. The second is a quasiclassical Wigner density functional approximation. The quasiclassical method uses Wigner's definition to calculate the phase space density $f(\vec{r}, \vec{p}, t = 0)$ from the incoming wavefunction Ψ_1 . The density f is then numerically time evolved *classically* until essentially the entire ensemble has escaped from the scatterer. The resulting distribution $f(\vec{r}, \vec{p}, t)$ is projected back onto an outgoing wavefunction Ψ_2 , which defines a scattering matrix. The two methods of calculating quantum scattering are compared. In cases where there is close agreement, one can conclude that the quantum dynamics is essentially

following the classical dynamics. For more details about these methods and the results obtained, see Refs. (11,9,12).

A quantum wavepacket encountering a very slowly varying potential has behavior quite similar to the classical case.³⁻⁻⁶ The Landau level index never changes. The only important modification required in Fig. (2) is that now a wavefunction follows guiding center trajectory. In the direction perpendicular to the local guiding center trajectory, the wavefunction for the ground Landau level is a gaussian of extent equal to a magnetic length $l = \sqrt{\hbar c / eB}$.

We now consider the relationship of quantum and classical dynamics for an abrupt potential. The (quantum) phase shift ϕ for typical scattering from an abrupt potential is shown in Fig. (10). The group velocity v_g is proportional to $-\partial\phi/\partial E$. The plot shows that the potential generally speeds up the electron, except at a resonance in the vicinity of energy $E = 1.14$, where the electron is slowed down significantly. Figure (11) shows the number of collisions N for *classical* scattering with parameters that have large weight in the corresponding Wigner density functional near the resonance. It can be seen that long classical orbits occur. (We have demonstrated analytically that infinitely long classical orbits occur, which appear finite in Fig.(11) because of finite numerical sampling.) The long classical trajectories circle the scatterer many times, as shown in Fig. (12). In contrast, the very short trajectories, which are more common, are deflected above the scatterer and immediately escape for the parameters of Fig. (12). The short trajectories do not orbit, and thus have no classical probability of being immediately below the scatterer.

This observation suggests that the relationship of quantum to classical scattering can be further tested by calculating the probability that the electron is immediately below the scatterer divided by the probability that it is immediately above the scatterer for the exact quantum eigenstate. Figure (13) shows that this probability is

sharply peaked at the center of the quantum resonance at $E = 1.14$. Thus quantum mechanically as well, a resonance occurs when the electron orbits the scatterer many times before escaping. Also shown in Fig. (13) is that there is also an enhanced probability of scattering into another Landau level at the center of the resonance.

Figure (14) shows the probability of scattering into the same (0) and higher (1) Landau levels for an abrupt rectangular scattering potential. The quasiclassical calculation gives a semiquantitative approximation to the exact result. It does, however, overestimate the amount of scattering out of the ground Landau level at low fields \vec{E} . Suppose one takes as a criterion for the breakdown of the QHE that there is a 10% probability to scatter into a higher Landau level. The breakdown field E_b is then found to vary strongly with the width of the scatterer in the \hat{y} direction. For a magnetic field of 4.7 T, the breakdown field is 225 V/cm for a scatterer that is 3.36 magnetic lengths wide and 80 V/cm for a scatterer 6.61 magnetic lengths wide. These breakdown fields are almost two orders of magnitude smaller than the Zener tunneling calculation for short range impurities.¹³ The present estimates are also in reasonable agreement with the measured value of 70 V/cm.¹⁰

The calculation of phase shifts using the quasiclassical method is more difficult than the calculation of scattering amplitudes. The calculation can be done, and in some cases shows semiquantitative agreement with the exact phase shifts.^{11,9,12}

There are some parallels to the potential scattering investigated here and 4 terminal junction behavior. Some recent papers on the theory of both classical and quantum transmission of electrons through 4 terminal junctions are given in Refs. (14–16). The first two of these references consider the behavior in magnetic fields.

V. SUMMARY

We have shown that classical potential scattering in a magnetic field is complex,

and exhibits resonances in which an arbitrarily large number of collisions occur. This applies not only to a hard wall potential that can be solved completely, but for generic scattering potentials with finite gradients. Only infinitely slowly varying potentials are in a class by themselves, with trivial scattering dynamics. Quantum scattering follows the classical dynamics rather closely, and shows sharp quantum resonances. We have also shown that extended scatterers can strongly enhance Zener tunneling, and provide a quantitative explanation for the breakdown of the quantum Hall effect.

Open questions include: (1) Finding a quantitative description for the change in guiding center and the number of collisions for general potentials. (2) Determining whether nonperiodic classical bound states exists for general potentials. (3) A more detailed comparison to experiments, particularly those measuring noise and fluctuation effects.

This work was supported by the US Department of Energy.

¹*The Quantum Hall Effect*, edited by R. E. Prange and S. M. Girvin (Springer-Verlag, New York, 1987).

²R. B. Laughlin, *Phys. Rev. B* **23**, 5632 (1981).

³S. A. Trugman, *Phys. Rev. B* **27**, 7539 (1983).

⁴R. E. Prange and R. Joynt, *Phys. Rev. B* **25**, 2943 (1982).

⁵S. V. Iordansky, *Solid State Commun.* **43**, 1 (1982).

⁶R. F. Kazarinov and S. Luryi, *Phys. Rev. B* **25**, 7626 (1982).

⁷S. A. Trugman, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **62**, 579 (1989).

- ⁸S. A. Trugman and F. R. Waugh, *Surf. Sci.* **196**, 171 (1988).
- ⁹V. Nikos Nicopoulos, Ph.D. Thesis, Princeton University, 1990 (unpublished).
- ¹⁰M. E. Cage *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **51**, 1374 (1983). G. Ebert *et al.*, *J. Phys. C* **16**, 5441 (1983).
- ¹¹V. Nikos Nicopoulos and S. A. Trugman, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **65**, 779 (1990).
- ¹²V. Nikos Nicopoulos and S. A. Trugman, in preparation.
- ¹³D. C. Tsui, G. J. Dolan, and A. C. Gossard, *Bull. Am. Phys. Soc.* **28**, 365 (1983).
- ¹⁴C. W. J. Beenakker and H. van Houten, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **63**, 1857 (1989).
- ¹⁵H. U. Baranger and A. D. Stone, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **63**, 414 (1989); H. U. Baranger, D. P. DiVencenzo, R. A. Jalabert, and A. D. Stone (unpublished).
- ¹⁶M. L. Roukes and O. L. Alerhand, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **65**, 1651 (1990).

FIG. 1. Potential scattering in zero magnetic field.

FIG. 2. The guiding center trajectory is shown as a heavy line for scattering from a smooth potential, for which two equipotential surfaces are shown. A portion of the full trajectory is shown on the left.

FIG. 3. Scattering from a hard square.

FIG. 4. Scattering from a horizontal wall.

FIG. 5. The number of collisions N maximized over initial angle θ as a function of $r = \alpha + \beta$, with $s = \alpha - \beta$ fixed at 0.2. N is plotted on a log scale.

FIG. 6. A periodic trajectory is shown as a heavy line. For slightly mistuned parameters, the trajectory does not quite close (light line), and eventually escapes.

FIG. 7. The set of parameters for which infinite trajectories exist. Plotted parameters are of the form $(r, s) = (j_1/p, j_2/p)$, with j_1 and j_2 integers and $p = 2520$.

FIG. 8. The trajectory starts near the tail of the arrow. The short, heavy line segments are arbitrary reflecting walls. To obtain a periodic trajectory, the final reflecting wall (striped) must be placed at the self-intersection point at the correct angle. A curve Λ that supports this periodic trajectory can be any curve that passes through the line segments with a tangent parallel to the line segment.

FIG. 9. A trajectory that collides with a hard wall is shown above, and with a smoothly rising potential is shown below. The potentials are nonzero inside of the shaded rectangles.

FIG. 10. Scattering phase shift for a free eigenstate encountering a rapidly varying potential that is strongly repulsive inside a rectangle. The phase shift is given when both the incoming and outgoing states are in the first excited Landau level. The energy is proportional to the y guiding center coordinate.

FIG. 11. Long classical orbits occur in parts of the region shown, with radius r plotted between 1.308 and 1.312, and the incoming phase θ between 2.337 and 2.339.

FIG. 12. A portion of a long classical trajectory occurring in Fig. (11) is shown.

FIG. 13. The probability for finding the electron directly below the scatterer divided by the probability for finding it above in the exact quantum eigenstate (squares). The probability of scattering into the second Landau level is shown by circles, right scale.

FIG. 14. Scattering probability of a ground Landau level (0) wave packet as a function of the Hall electric field. The solid lines are the results of the exact quantum calculation and the dashed lines are the results of the quasiclassical approximation. The probabilities for scattering into Landau levels higher than 1 are not shown.



























